

and Claim 35 was objected to for depending on rejected Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 1 and the objection of Claim 35.

As Applicants previously argued, Wilson does not anticipate Claim 1 because the remotely-located server/application recited in Claim 1 is not taught in Wilson. In the June 8, 1999 Office Action, the Examiner responded to this argument. The Examiner's position was that since the PC's of Wilson are able to control the system, it is inherent that a remote server must have been included in order to allow access of the system by the PC's.


Applicants note that while the PCs of Wilson are able to control the system, each of the components in the system (*e.g.*, the PC, the interface device, the input/output Bridge devices) are located *at the customer premises*. Thus, the "inherent" server in Wilson is also located *at the customer premises*. In contrast to the teachings of Wilson, Claim 1 recites a server that is *located remotely from the customer premises*. Because Wilson does not teach the element of a server located remotely from the customer premises, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and the objection to Claim 35 and pass this application to allowance.

Lastly, Applicants note that they have not yet received a copy of the initialed PTO 1449 form submitted with the June 3, 1998 Information Disclosure Statement. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants enclose a copy of the 1449 Form that was submitted with the June 3, 1998 Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants request that the Examiner return a copy of the initialed 1449 Form with the Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4719.

Dated: July 9, 1999

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph F. Hetz
Reg. No. 41,070
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4719